

STATINTL

## Today in World Affairs

# How Not to Hold Friends And Influence Our Allies

By David Lawrence

WASHINGTON.

An unprecedented method of attack has been employed to influence Gen. de Gaulle to change the policies of the French government so they will be more pleasing to the United States government.

Sen. J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, has just made a speech that expressed views which, it might have been expected, would be uttered only by the President or Secretary of State. For the executive branch of the government has heretofore jealously guarded its prerogative to conduct foreign relations.

It is conceivable, of course, that the Fulbright speech was cleared in advance by the Department of State. For it would seem incredible that a speech of this importance, attacking an allied government, would be made without the knowledge and consent of the executive branch of our government. But is President de Gaulle now to regard the Fulbright speech as the expression of the United States government?

Sen. Fulbright's words were bluntly expressed. He said, for instance:

"It is on this level of practical co-operation that French policy has been deeply disappointing to France's allies. It is a policy which, if long continued, could lead to the disruption of the Western Alliance, not by open repudiation but by abnegation in detail."

This is a very serious charge to be leveled at the head of a government allied with the United States. But more surprising is the statement that France's policy has been disappointing not only to the United States but to France's other allies. This will be disputed to some extent in Europe, but in this country it will be wondered why the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is privileged to speak in behalf of any of the allied governments.

When the leader in the French or British Parliaments makes a speech, he is talking as the head of both the government and the legislative branch. But in the United States, where Congress and the executive are separate institutions, it has always been understood that communications to

other governments would be handled only by the President or the Secretary of State.

Another surprising thing about the speech is that it was given on Oct. 30, but discussed statements made by President de Gaulle at a news conference July 29 last. It thus has the appearance of a carefully prepared attack, which may have been assigned to Sen. Fulbright to carry out.

This will not assist in the solving of difficulties between the United States and France. In fact, within the last 24 months, word has come from Paris that President De Gaulle has abandoned any idea of visiting the U. S. in the next several months, as had been previously reported.

Perhaps the most extraordinary part of the Fulbright speech is that in which he directed his remarks at President De Gaulle personally. Chairman Fulbright said:

"I don't believe that President de Gaulle is disposed at present to take such a dispassionate view of American policy. One perceives in his remarks of July 29 that he is still looking at America through the distorting prism of wounded pride."

It is significant that in this same speech the Arkansas Senator made a reference to France's unpaid debt from World War I to the United States. The total still unpaid, together with interest, amounts to more than \$6 billion, of which \$4.2 billion was due as of June 30, 1963. Mr. Fulbright referred to it as a "default" since June, 1945.

This reminder that France owes the United States money is a remarkable remark that the U. S. has not demanded payment

of the World War I debts of France and other European countries." But it was not indicated whether the demand may yet be made. The exact purpose of mentioning World War I debts is not clear, though Sen. Fulbright argued that meeting the debt due would help the "balance of payments" situation.

The whole purpose of the Fulbright speech was ostensibly to persuade Gen. de Gaulle to liberalize his trade policies. But it remains to be seen whether this form of attack will be persuasive with the strong-minded head of the French government.

While Sen. Fulbright asserted that the U. S. has not the slightest intention of standing aside if Europe is attacked and over-run, and a spokesman reiterated that this country is committed "unflinchingly to the defense of Europe," he pointed out that the more likely occurrence would be a Soviet "assault on the United States from which Europe would be spared." Sen. Fulbright insisted that Europe, including France, must commit itself to a unified defense of the west. He added that, while the United States is committed to such a defense, "this does not mean that it cannot be driven from Europe." He declared:

"If our partners pursue protectionist trade policies and decline to carry a proportion of the military and foreign aid burdens commensurate with their resources, the United States will be left with no choice but to reduce its commitments."

This is, to say the least, a most unusual commentary on the policies of an allied government and specifically on the attitude of the head of that government. For certainly it doesn't make negotiation easier, and it is an undiplomatic way to conduct the foreign relations of the United States. The question also arises whether it makes superfluous the two American ambassadors in Paris—one accredited to the French government and the other to the National Council of the Resistance.